



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/783,558

02/20/2004

Robert F. Day

304666.01/MFCP.143750

7539

45809

7590

07/06/2009

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

TOLENTINO, RODERICK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2439

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/783,558	Applicant(s) DAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Roderick Tolentino	Art Unit 2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/20/2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by amendment by applicant on 3/20/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 12, 14 – 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forler U.S. Patent No. (7,210,158) in view of Siegel et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0143961).
5. As per claims 1, 12 and 19, Forler teaches recognizing user input data relevant to an application as a user choice setting associated with the application, wherein the user choice setting determines at least one property of execution of at least one event of the application, storing the user choice setting as a protected value (Forler, Col. 6 Lines 39 – 50, user password protected settings), securing the user choice setting using

Art Unit: 2439

an access control indicator, wherein the access control indicator prohibits applications from modifying the user choice setting associated with the application (Forler, Col. 6 Lines 39 – 50, user password protected settings), receiving a request from the application to modify the user choice setting associated with the application (Forler, Col. 6 Lines 39 – 50, user password protected settings), in response to receiving a request from the application to modify the user choice setting associated with the application, generating an approval user interface requesting authorization of the modification from the user to modify the user choice setting (Forler, Col. 6 Lines 39 – 50, user password protected settings), receiving input from the user to determine a desired user choice setting associated with the application, modifying the user choice setting in accordance with the desired user choice setting (Forler, Col. 6 Lines 39 – 50, user password protected settings), but fails to teach restoring the access control indicator to prohibit applications from modifying the user choice setting associated with the application, wherein each step is executed on a computing device of the user. However, in an analogous art Siegel teaches restoring the access control indicator to prohibit applications from modifying the user choice setting associated with the application, wherein each step is executed on a computing device of the user (Siegel, 0026, Obvious that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Siegel's access control protocol for user profile

management with Forler's Program signal blocking system because it offers the advantage of preventing access to certain permissions by unauthorized parties (Siegel, Paragraph 0008).

6. As per claims 2 and 20, Forler as modified teaches wherein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and the protected value is a registry key stored in the registry (Siegel, Paragraphs 0019 and 0020, user preferences stored in a database) and the access control indicator is an access control list (ACL) that has been initialized to prevent writing to the protected value (Siegel, Paragraph 0004 and 0039, user permissions stored in a database with modification settings, use of passwords protect an account).

7. As per claims 3, 16 and 21 Forler as modified teaches herein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, Paragraphs 0020 and 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

8. As per claims 4, 17 and 22, Forler as modified teaches modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures, wherein ownership of the registry key automatically provides to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party

Art Unit: 2439

whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

9. As per claims 5, 18 and 23, Forler as modified teaches modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes allowing the user to temporarily take ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures after receiving the input from the user authorizing the application to modify the user choice setting on the user's behalf (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

10. As per claim 6, Forler as modified teaches restoring the access control indicator to prevent writing to the protected value includes removing user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

11. As per claims 7 and 25, Forler as modified teaches removing user rights to modify the ACL includes returning ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures to the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

12. As per claims 8 and 26, Forler as modified teaches generating a user choice setting user interface (UI), displaying the current user choice setting on the UI along

with other options for the user choice setting (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, interface for user to modify settings) and receiving the authorizing input from the UI, along with a further input indicating a modified user choice setting including at least one of the other displayed options for the user choice setting Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

13. As per claims 10, 14 and 28, Forler as modified teaches the user choice settings of a task association, this choice being one of the options listed by the applicant's claim language (Siegel, Paragraph 0004, user can change permissions regarding the task of what clients have access to).

14. As per claims 11, 15 and 29, Forler as modified teaches the registered client setting includes at least one of a Web browser, this choice being one of the options listed by the applicant's claim language (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, web browser).

15. As per claim 24, Forler as modified teaches the instruction to lock the ACL to prevent writing to the protected value includes an instruction to remove user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

16. Claims 9, 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forler U.S. Patent No. (7,210,158) in view of Siegel et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0143961) in view of Giordano, III et al. U.S. Patent No, (6,370,141).

17. As per claims 9, 13 and 27, Forler fails to teach generating a change notification to the user whenever the user choice setting has been modified, the change notification identifying the application that modified the user setting and the contents of the protected value before and after the modification. However, in an analogous art Giordano teaches generating a change notification to the user whenever the user choice setting has been modified, the change notification identifying the application that modified the user setting and the contents of the protected value before and after the modification (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

At the time the invention was made, it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Giordano's apparatus for configuring internet appliance with Forler's Program signal blocking system because it offers the advantage of letting a user know of changed made to a system (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roderick Tolentino whose telephone number is (571) 272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2439

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christian LaForgia/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2439

/R. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2439